DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 462 SO 012 964

AUTHOR Baker, Therese L.
TITLE Class, Family, Education and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of American and British Women College Graduates.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE Aug 80
GRANT NIMH-RO3MH30416
NOTE 19p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (New York, NY, August, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Birth Rate: *College Graduates: Comparative Analysis: *Cross Cultural Studies: *Educational Attainment: Family Characteristics: *Females: Longitudinal Studies: Marriage: *Socioeconomic Status: *Success
IDENTIFIERS Great Britain: United States

ABSTRACT

This study of women college graduates in the United States and Great Britain analyzes the effect of social origins and familial factors on educational attainment. The sample consisted of 1,435 American and 1,805 British females who graduated in 1961 and 1960 respectively. Longitudinal data were drawn from the National Opinion Research Center and a study by Keith Kelsall at Sheffield University. The study examined the womens' life histories at the time of university graduation, their educational attainment, and their marital and fertility characteristics seven years after graduation. Results indicate that the British graduates had achieved higher socioeconomic status attainment than had the Americans. The data reveal that attainment patterns for American and British women are quite different. The class of degree achieved and undergraduate specialization in the natural sciences or mathematics have an important effect on British women, whereas family background characteristics and characteristics of the undergraduate experience are significant for American women. Also, the status of the undergraduate university is not as influential for American women as it is for British women. In addition, British women tend to forego mothering for a career while American women tend to combine the two. Major differences seem to be a result of early selection for academic training in Great Britain which lends a power to the holders that carries over into occupational careers. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195462

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Therese L. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Class, Family, Education and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of American and British Women College Graduates*

SP 012 964

Therese L. Baker
Associate Professor of Sociology
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

*This research was conducted while I was supported by NIMH Grant #RO3MH30416.

Use of cross-national data to study the occupational attainment of American women provides for same-sex comparisons that American opposite-sex data clearly do not permit. To bring aspects of women's familial circumstances into focus in relation to the status attainment process requires a level of control on other factors--such as social class origins, educational attainment, etc.--that would otherwise compound the analysis. Such control may be better attained by comparing comparable groups of women across nations, than by studying non-comparable groups of women within one nation. This assumes, of course, that the nations chosen have economic and value systems which are not so disparate as to obviate the comparability of occupational outcomes.

The purpose of this paper is to compare occupational status attainment of women college graduates in the United States and Great Britain. By largely controlling for education, age, and time of graduation, as well as selecting countries with roughly similar economic, political, and cultural systems, a more concentrated analysis of effects of social origins and familial factors can be achieved.

Previous Research

There are three areas of research that bear on this problem: studies on British and American cross-national status attainment and mobility, studies on women's status attainment (often in comparison with men's) and studies on educated women and work.

British and American Status Attainment: Considerations of the educational systems of Britain and the United States and their implications for occupational status and mobility have been influenced by Ralph Turner's (1960) conceptualization of the relationship between education and social mobility in Britain and America. He characterized the more meritocratic British system of education (as it developed after World War II) as one which "sponsors" the mobility of its intellectually able, regardless of social origin. In order to carry out this form of social engineering, careful selection at a fairly early age is necessary. Those who are chosen receive

their secondary schooling separately and are educated toward the goal of successfully passing national examinations requisite for university entrance. In contrast, the less structured, less selective, American system allows for a long-ranging contest to attain higher credentials open to a much wider sector of the population. Kerchoff's (1974) study questioned the validity of Turner's hypothesis. Although measured ability and socio-economic origins may have had critical effects at different points in the educational process of the two countries, Kerchoff found that those males who were ultimately successful in the British educational system did not differ appreciably from American males of like educational attainment.

Treiman and Terrell (1975), using a national survey of adult males, also concluded that educational attainment played a similar role in the occupational mobility of British and American men despite differences in the systems of education. However, the great majority of the adult men examined by Treiman and Terrell had been educated prior to the 1944 Education Act, which established the British system of education characterized by Turner as "sponsoring." Their findings cannot therefore be used to support a systematic challenge to Turner's argument regarding the differential effects of "sponsored" and "contest" educational systems on social mobility. Furthermore, since the ages of men varied in their survey, the length of time elapsed between the culmination of education and the point at which their occupational statuses were measured differed considerably. This could well have obscured the more immediate effects of education on first job, success in which then determined later career outcomes.

Occupational Status Attainment of Women: Until the 1970s, women were systematically ignored in status attainment research. At the beginning of the decade some important works appeared on the scope and causes of women's participation in the labor force (Bowen and Finegan, 1969; Oppenheimer, 1970; Sweet, 1973). These studies by economists and demographers and the series of Ohio State studies on the labor market experience of women (Parnes et al., 1970) established the foundations for a consideration of the comparability of the status attainment

process for men and women. Comparisons indicated that for men and women in the United States no major sex differences appeared in the level of status attainment reached or the process through which career positions were achieved (Treiman and Terrell, 1975; Featherman and Hauser, 1976; McClendon, 1976). McClendon (1976) determined that educational attainment was the strongest determinant of status for each sex and that the factors determining educational attainment were similar for the two sexes. Education of the like-sex parent was not found to be a stronger determinant of educational attainment for either men or women than was the education of the cross-sex parent. Treiman and Terrell (1975) also saw the process of educational attainment as "virtually identical" for men and women though they indicated weak support for the association between the like-sex parent's educational attainment and that of the subject's. Using Treiman's Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale (Treiman, 1978) which they claimed to be more similar for men and women than a socioeconomic index,[1] Treiman and Terrell found that "for both men and women, occupational status is largely dependent upon educational attainment and only slightly dependent upon social origins " (Treiman and Terrell, 1975:197).

Educated Women and Work: Research on working women has increased dramatically both as an indicator of the increase in the number of working women as well as the interest in understanding (so as to alter) women's positions in the economic structure. Although higher education is consistently related to increased employment for women in the United States and Great Britain, marriage, fertility plans and behaviors alter the choice of whether or not to pursue a career, the type of career to pursue and the means for accomodating careers to familial life. Research to refine the relationship between work, marriage and fertility for educated American women has found that work will vary with length of marriage, number and age of children, support of husband, husband's educational and income levels, wife's "taste for housework", child care ideology and, not the least important, work commitment of the woman (Bielby, 1978; Spitze and Spaeth, 1978; Perrucci and Targ, 1978).

In Britain the well-known work on dual-career couples (Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971) is a part of a larger corpus of work on the outcome of British graduates originally studied by Kelsall (1970; 1972) and his colleagues. In their study (1972), the latter bemoaned the lack of ambition and serious career motivation of the graduate women they investigated. Subject to ideologies encouraging women to make a career of secondary importance to their families, British graduate women of 1960 were seemingly unwilling to compete for the high level occupational positions or to push for changes in the nature of home life that would have enabled them to pursue their careers more vigorously. Fogarty and the Rapoports (1971), following up Kelsall's graduates eight years after graduation, found that those who were married, with or without children, were more convinced that their college education had been beneficial to their career than were the unmarried.

The discussion thus far has indicated that there is no strong evidence to assume that the status attainment process differs systematically between Britons and Americans or between American women and men. Furthermore, it is clear that for both British and American women educated in the Sixties, careers were undertaken, given up or pursued in relation to, and often contingent upon, familial constraints. The question this study will address is whether the predictors of occupational status attainment are similar for British and American college graduates, how far graduate education furthers the career achievements of women and whether marital and childbearing factors differentially affect the occupational pursuits of British and American educated women.

Turner did not specifically relate his thesis to women. But the effects of sponsorship would seem likely to enhance the opportunities of talented girls at an early age where they would benefit from the sense that their abilities were being "taken seriously," from the recognition of their fellow students and families that they possessed socially-valued academic talent, and from the encouragement of their teachers to pursue training in specific fields in which they excelled. This form of academic socialization would seem likely to diminish the importance

of social-sexual differences in behavior that occur across the adolescent years. If, in contrast, the American system is an open-ended degree-seeking process where the hard-working and persistent succeed (largely irrespective of their talents) then differences in these motivations and behaviors may account for different occupational outcomes between the sexes.

Taking Turner's theoretical design of British education, it is expected that sponsorship in the British educational system should have the following effects on the career outcomes of British women graduates:

1) reduce the importance of social class origins on occupational status since sponsorship should have largely erased negative social class attributes;
2) increase the effect of attending a prestigious undergraduate college (Oxford or Cambridge) on occupational status because selection to such an institution implies the highest level of sponsorship.

Alternatively, the American "contest" system should have the following effects on American women graduates:

1) give greater credit to higher credentials beyond an undergraduate degree for American women as a claim to higher level occupational status commensurate with a British undergraduate degree;
2) socialize women in the skills necessary for succeeding in a long-term competition (aggressiveness, persistence, the ability to overcome obstacles) that might better steel them for the obstacles likely to be thrown up in the occupational sector.

Data, Methods, and Variables: The data used in this project comprise the two most widely known national surveys of graduates respectively in each country. The American data are from the National Opinion Research Center's five-wave longitudinal survey of a national sample of 1961 spring term college graduates followed up five times during the decade of the Sixties. The sampling was based on a two-stage probability design in which 135 institutions were selected at the

first stage and graduating seniors from these colleges and universities were drawn at the second stage. This research is based on the respondents to the 1968 follow-up who were a thirty per cent sub-sample of those who had responded to each of the earlier waves. This group included 2969 women.[2]

The British data were drawn from a postal survey undertaken by Keith Kelsall and his colleagues at Sheffield University in 1966 to sample the population of 1960 British graduates. The sample included all female graduates and half of the males. Eighty-one per cent of the 1960 graduates responded, including 3212 women.[3]

The three-year British degree and the four-year American degree make 1960 British and 1961 American graduates virtually the same age cohort. Moreover, the 1966-67 follow-up of the British graduates provides roughly the same lapse of time since graduation as the fifth-wave, 1968, follow-up of the 1961 American graduates. In short, though these data sets were independently created and have never before been compared, they bear striking similarities. For this analysis women born prior to 1935, non-white women, foreign students and women not employed at the time of the final survey are excluded.[4] This created a final n of 1435 for the Americans and 1805 for the British.

The method used is a regression analysis in which occupational status attainment scale scores of working women seven years after graduation are regressed on three increasingly inclusive sets of predictor variables, forming the basis for three models. These sets of independent variables represent factors characterizing the women's life histories 1) at the time of their graduation from university; 2) further including their graduate educational attainment and 3) incorporating marital and fertility characteristics seven years after graduation. Model One represents ascribed qualities of social background and family of origin and characteristics of undergraduate career. In Britain, where selection for higher education comes early, the talent necessary for such selection is considered more innate. In the United States, completing an undergraduate degree is deemed largely

due to achievement (with some advantage to those from socially favored origins). Model Two includes post-graduate educational training. In both countries, such training would be a mark of academic achievement, though in Great Britain it would be more likely to be viewed as a natural culmination to early developed and recognized talents. Graduate training (as for undergraduate accomplishment) is, in the United States, further evidence of motivation, determination and persistance. Model Three adds in a set of factors representing qualities of a woman's family of procreation such as number of children.

Model 1 will include:

a. Father's occupation: Treiman scores from father's occupation prior to the time that respondent entered university

b. Mother's education: number of years of schooling

c. Number of siblings

d. Undergraduate achievement: in the United States based on cumulative grade point average, in Britain on the class of the undergraduate degree (i.e., a first, an upper second, etc.)

e. High status undergraduate university: in the U.S. attending a college or university ranked as Class I in a four-category system developed by NORC on the basis of the average National Merit Scholarship Test scores of the undergraduate student body; in Britain attending Oxford or Cambridge; a dichotomous variable.

f. Undergraduate major of natural science or math: in U.S., majoring in the natural sciences or math, in Britain "reading" such a subject as the sole basis of the undergraduate education; a dichotomous variable;

g. Aspirations to follow a career in education held at the end of undergraduate studies; a dichotomous variable.

Model 2 includes the two additional indicators of graduate school involvement:

h. Length of graduate school education: years of graduate school completed

i. Ph.D. attainment: a dichotomous variable

Model 3 incorporates measures of marital status and fertility as well as a quality of the spouse:

j. Marital status--never married: a dichotomous variable

k. Age at first marriage

l. Husband's educational attainment: number of years of schooling

m. Number of children

n. Age of oldest child

Results

Table 1 offers descriptive statistics that help to clarify the differences between the two sets of women. British women graduates in the 1960s had fathers with higher socio-economic status (Treiman score of 59.56 for the British, 48.39 for the Americans), mothers with more years of schooling (14.30 for the British, 13.11 for the Americans) and fewer siblings (1.29 for the British to 1.80 for the Americans). In short, however much sponsorship of working class youth transpired in Britain for the cohort of 1960 university graduates, the women graduates were more representative of the middle to upper-middle classes than were American women graduates of the same era.

Differences in undergraduate achievement levels between the two countries were slight. Exactly the same proportion of British women had graduated from Oxford or Cambridge as American women had graduated from universities and college in the United States ranked as Class 1 by NORC (12 per cent in each case). A much larger proportion of British women had "read" natural sciences or math at university as compared to American women who had "majored" in these subjects (20 per cent to 6 per cent)--surely evidence of sponsored support for women to study science overcoming their traditional reluctance to compete in what has been so fully defined as a male

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations and Zero-Order Correlations for Variables in a Model of Women's Status Gains: Women Working in 1967 (Britain) 1968 (U.S.)[a]

Variable[b]	FAOCC	MAED	#SIBS	ACH	STATCOL	MAJNS	ASPED	YRSGS	PHD	SGL	AGEMAR	HUSED	#KIDS	OLDCHLD	OCSTAT	British Mean	British SD
FAOCC	____	-.093	-.062	-.008	-.018	.001	-.076	-.019	-.007	-.008	-.022	-.012	.050	-.042	-.017	59.56	10.23
MAED	-.473	____	.079	-.008	.123	-.056	.020	-.040	-.065	.037	.100	-.001	.013	-.004	-.026	14.30	2.16
#SIBS	-.107	-.102	____	-.017	.041	.010	-.010	.012	-.022	.022	.001	-.042	.068	-.069	-.031	1.29	1.28
ACH	.072	.004	-.087	____	.061	-.079	-.026	.208	.213	-.043	-.027	.068	.056	-.059	.183	4.67	1.25
STATCOL	.233	.108	.001	-.003	____	-.008	-.015	.055	.080	-.005	-.051	.062	.080	-.089	.107	.12	.33
MAJNS	.083	.054	-.035	.129	.113	____	.087	-.051	.106	-.089	.037	.071	-.035	.049	.166	.20	.40
ASPED	-.180	-.089	-.014	.001	-.193	-.135	____	-.038	-.007	.047	____	-.039	-.018	.020	.070	.002	.04
YRSGS	.166	.141	-.087	.232	.103	-.019	-.099	____	.448	.072	.119	-.008	-.116	.100	.186	.89	.96
PHD	.097	.142	-.057	.219	.038	.009	-.122	.436	____	-.025	.027	.047	-.018	.007	.246	.04	.19
SGL	.017	-.054	-.066	-.056	.039	-.042	-.131	.139	.037	____	____	____	-.388	.427	-.043	.44	.50
AGEMAR	-.086	.111	-.022	.036	.126	.137	.027	-.000	-.004	____	____	-.050	-.387	.368	.058	24.44	2.12
HUSED	.137	.159	-.105	.239	.079	-.011	-.032	.212	.093	____	-.083	____	.371	-.414	.069	13.88	1.97
#KIDS	.008	-.021	.041	-.021	-.105	-.130	-.059	-.169	-.071	____	-.332	.008	____	-.903	-.001	.30	.67
OLDCHLD	-.159	.022	.063	-.000	-.058	-.122	.419	.055	____	____	-.066	-.080	.573	____	.005	6.68	3.18
OCSTAT	.052	-.055	.064	.164	.061	.084	.070	.328	.279	.032	-.024	.074	-.147	-.137	____	64.07	8.06
																N=1805	
U.S. Mean	48.39	13.11	1.80	5.39	.12	.06	.52	1.08	.02	.30	21.91	15.85	.99	6.36	57.33		
U.S. SD	14.03	2.83	1.58	1.53	.33	.23	.50	1.29	.14	.46	1.38	1.87	1.04	3.99	8.08		
																N=1435	

[a]Values for British are above diagonal; values for U.S. are below.

[b]FAOCC=father's occupational status attainment when subject was 16(Treiman Scale); MAED=Mother's number of years of schooling completed; #SIBS=Number of brothers and sisters; ACH=Undergraduate academic achievement (Britain = class of degree, U.S. = grade point average); STATCOL=High status of undergraduate university or college (1 = Oxford or Cambridge in Britain, NORC Class I Universities and colleges in U.S., 0 = not high status college or university); MAJNS=Undergraduate major of natural science or math (1=yes, 0=no); ASPED=Undergraduate aspiration at time of graduation to be a teacher (1=yes, 0=no); YRSGS=Number of years of graduate school completed; PHD=Attain PHD (1=yes, 0=no); SGL=Single (never married) in 1967 (Britain) 1968 (U.S.) (1=yes, 0=no); AGEMAR=Age at marriage; HUSED=Husband's number of years of schooling completed; #KIDS=Number of children in 1967 (Britain) 1968 (U.S.); OLDCHLD=Age of oldest child; OCSTAT=Occupational status attainment in 1967 (Britain) 1968 (U.S.) (Treiman Scale).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

domain. A much smaller proportion of British graduate women than American aspired to be teachers at the time of graduation.

American women spent more time in graduate school on the average than the British, but a slightly larger proportion of British women had received the Ph.D. degree within seven years after graduation.[5] In terms of marital and fertility contingencies, forty-four per cent of the British women were single by 1967 as compared to 30 per cent of the American women in 1968. Those British who had married, had married later (24.44 years for the British as compared to 21.91 years for the Americans). Husbands of the American women had completed more years of schooling than had the British women's husbands. Moreover, the American graduates had more children on the average (.99 for the Americans, .30 for the British) though there were virtually no differences in the average age of the oldest child. Finally, and not of least significance, the British women graduates had achieved higher socio-economic status attainment seven years after graduation from university than had the Americans (64.07 for the British women on the Treiman scale as compared to 57.33 for the Americans.)

How can one explain the greater status achievement of the British women and the differential influence of the prior factors? Table 2 presents the three sets of variables cumulatively considered so as to develop more complex explanatory models to account for occupational status attainment. Model 1 includes those variables characterizing the graduate at her time of graduation, i.e., characteristics of her family of orientation and of her undergraduate university experience. For the British graduates, none of the family of orientation measures carry a statistically significant effect in the model while all of the undergraduate indicators have important effects on occupational attainment, especially the class of degree attained at university and undergraduate specialization in the natural sciences or mathematics. In comparison, occupational attainment of American women was affected by family background characteristics (most strongly by number of siblings which carried a positive influence) as well as by characteristics of the undergraduate

TABLE 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Models of Women's Occupational Status Attainment:
British Women Working in 1967; U.S. Women Working in 1968

Independent Variables[a]	1			2			3		
	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	F	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	F	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standardized Coefficient	F
British (N=1805)									
FAOCC	-.01	-.01	.37	-.01	-.01	.20	-.01	-.01	.17
MAED	-.10	-.03	1.39	-.05	-.01	.32	-.08	-.02	.80
#SIBS	-.20	-.03	1.90	-.19	-.03	1.83	-.18	-.03	1.60
ACH	1.24*	.19	70.88	.90*	.14	37.18	.90*	.14	36.39
STATCOL	2.51*	.10	19.80	2.12*	.09	14.66	2.12*	.09	14.43
MAJNS	3.52*	.18	58.90	3.22*	.16	50.45	3.11*	.16	46.53
ASPED	11.78*	.06	7.02	12.65*	.06	8.45	12.97*	.07	8.88
YRSGS				.81*	.10	14.75	.76*	.09	12.43
PHD				6.33*	.15	34.27	6.33*	.15	34.31
SGL							.42	.03	.37
AGEMAR							.21	.06	5.01
HUSED							.25	.06	2.06
#KIDS							.63	.05	1.00
OLDCHLD							.01	.04	.58
Constant	59.61			59.36			50.19		
Multiple R	.29			.35			.36		
R^2	.08			.12			.13		
U.S. (N=1435)									
FAOCC	.05*	.09	8.81	.04	.07	6.17	-.004	-.01	.05
MAED	-.26*	-.09	9.37	-.39*	-.14	25.19	-.22*	-.08	7.46
#SIBS	.42*	.08	9.92	.52*	.10	17.42	.63*	.12	27.58
ACH	.82*	.16	35.28	.28	.05	4.32	.30	.06	5.12
STATCOL	1.52	.06	5.23	1.03	.04	2.74	1.99*	.08	10.43
MAJNS	2.44*	.07	7.14	3.46*	.10	16.43	3.64*	.11	18.90
ASPED	1.63*	.10	14.27	2.30*	.14	32.37	5.21*	.32	109.26
YRSGS				1.64*	.26	91.95	2.07*	.33	131.89
PHD				10.70*	.19	47.39	10.86*	.19	52.46
SGL							.58	.03	1.87
AGEMAR							-.19	-.03	1.56
HUSED							-.14	-.03	1.58
#KIDS							1.28*	.17	20.22
OLDCHLD							-.77*	-.38	96.62
Constant	51.85			54.60			61.69		
Multiple R	.24			.43			.50		
R^2	.06			.19			.25		

[a]Dependent variable = OCSTAT; Variables are defined in footnote b, Table 1.
*$p < .01$.

experience. For both the British and Americans, it is interesting to note, mother's educational level had negative influence on daughter's occupational attainment (though the British association was not statistically significant). For the American women, both a less educated mother and one who had borne more children helped to increase the predictability of daughter's occupational attainment. Perhaps these mothers provided negative role models to avoid rather than to replicate.

Status of undergraduate university is not influential for American women whereas it is for the British. British women get somewhat greater occupational returns from their undergraduate college experience, especially if they receive a high class honors degree, have attended Oxford or Cambridge or have studied the "hard" sciences. The cumulative grade point average, based on achievement in formal courses--a measure of academic success[6] --had the strongest effect for American women. But qualities of family of orientation were much more equal to undergraduate factors in determining American women's occupational achievement. This suggests that while the British system sponsored women of higher social origins, the effects of this selective process were to diminish the salience of class background.

Model 2 brings in the two post-graduate educational factors, years of graduate school completed and attainment of the Ph.D. degree. Both of these measures were positively and significantly influential upon occupational status attainment for both national groups, but especially the Americans. Number of years in graduate school has greater positive effect for the American graduates than attaining the Ph.D. The reverse is true for the British. This might be accounted for by the greater proclivity of American women to gain higher degrees in relation to professional careers (library science, social work, etc.) that would less often require such graduate training in Britain.

Model 3 adds characteristics of the woman's family of procreation to

all of the earlier variables. None of these factors has a significant effect in the British pattern, but both the fertility measures are influential for the American. By comparing Models 2 and 3, one can see that the inclusion of family of procreation measures, though not significant for the British, nevertheless slightly reduces the effects of all of the previously significant educational measures (except for aspirations for education and Ph.D. attainment which are held at the same level). For the American women, the pattern is quite different. Inclusion of the family indicators actually increases the previously significant positive effects of educational attainment. This supports the conception that early selection for academic training in Great Britain lends a power to the holders that carries over into occupational careers and supercedes subsequent outcomes. American women college graduates' activities beyond their undergraduate years build on and alter the impact of the undergraduate attainment.

Conclusion

Turner defined the objective of contest mobility as giving elite status to those who earn it; the goal of sponsored mobility as making the best use of talents by sorting people into appropriate niches. Early selection of the talented reinforces the belief that educational and occupational abilities are largely inherited and natural, rather than acquirable. In this sense, they belong with the "natural" ability of childbearing and are not thought of as different in kind. If abilities are natural then they can be realized in any appropriate setting. Since childbearing is a "natural" ability, mothering may be considered the most appropriate niche for women with children, regardless of their other trained talents.

For British women, marriage and childbearing, one set of natural abilities, may replace the pursuit of occupational achievement based on the development of an alternate set of natural abilities. Or, conversely, British educated women who choose to push their educated talents to attain occupational goals may forestall (or forego) marriage and childbearing pursuing one strain of natural

talents in lieu of another.

For Americans, whose educational attainments are considered less a result of natural endowment than of achieved capacities and goals, childbearing may similarly be thought of as one of a range of possible goals to be achieved. In this sense, pursuit of graduate education or a career in combination with marriage and childbearing may present itself less as a refusal to choose between two "natural" activities than as a choice of a more complex and difficult set of goals to achieve. The competitive, non-supportive type of environment in which American women have had to pursue their education may, unintentionally, have prepared them to confront the competitive, non-supportive occupational world facing working mothers. The British working mothers in this study may represent the tendency to adopt attitudes towards education/career and family that have here been identified as achievement-oriented. If this tendency continues to grow, we would expect the activities of British educated women to more closely parallel their American sisters.

FOOTNOTES

1
Treas and Tyree (1979) contest this view arguing that the Treiman Scale is more subject to random error (especially for men) than the Duncan SEI Scale.

2
All the analyses for the U.S. data are based on a weighted sample developed by NORC to compensate for the overrepresentation of students from universities with larger student populations. For a more complete discussion of the original sample, see Davis (1964).

3
Graduates of Bristol University and the faculties of Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science were unrepresented in the original sample design.

4
Fligstein and Wolf (1978) found there was little evidence to support the theory put forth to account for the similarity in men's and women's status attainment--namely that women who could not find jobs commensurate with their education and could afford to remain outside the labor force would do so.

5
This may be accounted for by differences in doctoral training. U.S. Ph.D. programs usually include three years of course work prior to the preparation of a dissertation. In Britain, there are, generally, no formal courses and dissertation research is begun upon entry to graduate school.

6
It should be emphasized here that while cumulative grade point average for Americans and class of degree for the British are comparable as indicators of undergraduate academic achievement, they are measures of quite distinct entities. GPA is based on averaging marks assigned in each course additive to the total required for graduation; a class for a degree is determined largely by the mark given for a single examination taken at the completion of three years of study (although an examination after the second year is also usually held). The causes of possible unreliability in these two measures are, therefore, quite different. GPA is much more sensitive to a student's weak areas that might need to be pursued to fulfill distributional requirements. The class of a British degree is more subject to the unpredictable outcome of basing a final judgment on a single performance.

REFERENCES

Bielby, Denise D. 1978. "Career Sex-Atypicality and Career Involvement of College Educated Women: Baseline Evidence from the 1960's." Sociology of Education 51 (January):7-28.

Bowen, William and T. Aldrich Finegan. 1969. The Economics of Labor Force Participation. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Davis, James A. 1964. Great Aspiration: The Graduate School Plans of America's College Seniors. Chicago: Aldine.

Featherman, D.L. and R.M. Hauser. 1976. "Sexual Inequalities and Socioeconomic Achievement in the United States 1962-73." American Sociological Review 41 (June):462-83.

Fligstein, Neil D. and Wendy C. Wolf. 1978. "Sex Similarities in Occupational Status Attainment: Are the Results due to the Restriction of the Sample to Employed Women?" Social Science Research 7(June):197-212.

Fogarty, Michael P., Rhona Rapoport and Robert N. Rapoport. 1971. Sex, Career and Family. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.

Kelsall, R. Keith, Anne Poole and Annette Kuhn. 1970. Six Years After: First Report of a National Follow-up Survey of Ten Thousand Graduates of British Universities in 1960. Sheffield: Higher Education Research Unit, Department of Sociological Studies, Sheffield University.

_____. 1972. Graduates: The Sociology of an Elite. London:Methuen.

Kerchoff, Alan C. 1974. "Stratification Processes and Outcomes in England and the United States." American Sociological Review 39(December):789-801.

Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade. 1970. The Female Labor Force in the United States. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies.

Parnes, Herbert S. et al. 1975. Dual Careers Volume 4. Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Perrucci, Carolyn C. and Dena B. Targ. 1978. "Early Work Orientation and Later Situational Factors as Elements of Work Commitment among Married Women College Graduates." The Sociological Quarterly 19(Spring): 266-80.

Rapoport, Rhona and Robert N. Rapoport. 1971. Dual-Career Families. London: Penguin.

Spitze, Glenna D. and Joe L. Spaeth. 1978. "Employment among Married Female College Graduates." Lithographed. Urbana: Department of Sociology and Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Sweet, James A. 1973. Women in the Labor Force. New York: Seminar Press.

Treas, J. and A. Tyree. 1979. "Prestige versus Socioeconomic Status in the Attainment Process of American Men and Women." Social Science Research 8 (September):201-21.

Treiman, Donald J. 1978. Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Treiman, Donald J. and Kermit Terrell. 1975. "The Process of Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain." American Journal of Sociology 81 (November): 563-83.

Turner, Ralph. 1960. "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System." American Sociological Review 25(December): 855-67.